



California State Board of Education July 2019 Agenda Item #01

Subject

Update on the Implementation of the Integrated Local, State, and Federal Accountability and Continuous Improvement System: Recommended Action Regarding Implementation of a Combined Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator and the Application of the Three-by-Five Color Table to the College/Career Indicator, and an Update on the Federal Waiver and Identification of Schools Related to the English Learner Progress Indicator.

Type of Action

Action, Information

Summary of the Issue(s)

This item will present recommended changes to two state indicators—the Graduation Rate Indicator and the College/Career Indicator (CCI)—beginning with the 2019 California School Dashboard (Dashboard) and provide an update on the federal waiver and identification of schools related to the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI). Staff will present an overview of the new Dashboard Mobile Application, new College/Career Indicator and county-level reports, and discuss the additional website language translations planned for the 2019–20 school year.

Recommendation

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) approve: (1) a combined four- and five-year graduation rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator; and (2) the application of the three-by-five color table to the CCI.

Brief History of Key Issues

Combined Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator includes the four-year cohort graduation rate and the one-year Dashboard Alternative Schools Status (DASS) graduation rate. It does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The SBE has expressed an interest in using the five-year cohort graduation rate as part of the Dashboard, as it could provide an opportunity for schools to demonstrate success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities, English learners [ELs], etc.).

The five-year graduation rate is intended to be a determination of the high school outcomes of the preceding four-year cohort *non-graduates* in year five. As such, it compares the outcomes of the same group of students one year later and offers schools and districts additional time and incentive to work with and provide support to those students who did not graduate within four years.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides states the option to include a five-year graduation rate in the accountability system. However, states are required to set a more rigorous long-term goal for an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (or five-year rate), as compared to the long-term goal set for the four-year cohort graduation rate. Based on a CDE review of the approved states plans for all 49 states and Puerto Rico, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved plans that created a combined four- and five-year graduation rate and used the same long-term goal. A summary of the review is provided in Appendix A. Based on the ED's prior approval of five-year graduation rates (<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html>), using a combined rate would allow California to take the five-year graduation rate into account without having to create a separate long-term goal, add an additional indicator, and/or another five-by-five colored table.

The CDE prepared several simulations, using graduation data from both the Class of 2018 (i.e., students graduating within four years) and the Class of 2017 (i.e., students graduating in four years plus students who graduated in the five years). Distributions and analyses are provided in Attachment 1.

Application of the Three-by-Five Color Table to the CCI

Application of the three-by-five color table results in a refiguring of the performance level tables by removing two Change levels—Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly—and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations. This methodology, which limits large swings in the Change data that can be triggered by just a few students, has been approved for three state indicators:

- Graduation Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are in the graduating cohort
- Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are cumulatively enrolled
- Chronic Absenteeism Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are enrolled

The CDE proposes that, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI, which is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator. The impact of this proposed change is shown in Attachment 2.

Every Student Succeeds Act Waiver and Identification of Schools Related to the English Learner Progress Indicator

At the July SBE meeting, staff will update the SBE on two issues related the ELPI under the ESSA.

Waiver

As described in more detail in an April 2019 information memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-gad-lao-apr19item02.docx>), the CDE and the SBE received a final determination of disapproval letter from the ED related to California's request for a waiver, which had overwhelming support from California stakeholders, to allow the inclusion of: (1) reclassified fluent English proficient (RFEP) students in the ELPI; and (2) an additional weight in the ELPI calculation for long-term English Learners (LTEL) who advanced at least one level on California's English Proficiency assessment. This final determination represents the final step in the waiver process, and there are not further appeals available.

Identification of Schools

As described in more detail in a June 2019 information memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-gacsb-gad-jun19item02.docx>), the ED sent a letter to the SBE and CDE with notification that they had designated California's Title I, Part A grant award as "high risk". This is essentially a condition on the Title I, Part A grant for the 2018-19 school year. It requires that California calculate the ELPI and use it for school identification in 2019-20, which California had committed to doing before ED raised this issue. The SBE and CDE sent a response letter dated June 13, 2019, arguing that this designation is unnecessary as California provided the ED in December 2018 with a proposed Amendment

to the ESSA State Plan detailing our commitment to incorporate the ELPI into the identification of CSI and ATSI schools for the 2019–20 school year, which is the specific condition that ED noted as necessary to remove the high-risk determination on the Title I grant.

Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action

Combined Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate

At the March 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE provided an update on the development of the work to incorporate the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In an August 2018 Information Memorandum, the CDE presented a set of recommended business rules for calculating a five-year graduation rate. (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>).

At the March 2019 SBE meeting, the CDE outlined five options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the 2019 Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>)

Application of the Three-by-Five Color Table to the CCI

In September 2017, the SBE approved an alternative methodology—known as the “Three-by-Five” color grid—for assigning performance levels to local education agencies (LEAs) or schools that serve small student populations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

In July 2018, the SBE approved that the methodology also be applied at the student group level for the graduation rate and suspension rate indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

At the November 2018 meeting, the SBE approved applying this methodology to the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (reported for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard), when 149 or fewer students are enrolled (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

At the March 2019 SBE meeting, the CDE proposed that, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the CCI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>). This proposal was made because the CCI is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator, which already applies the three-by-five table to small student populations. The proposal receives the support of the Technical Design Group.

Federal Waiver and Identification of Schools Related to the English Learner Progress Indicator

Waiver

At the April 2018 SBE meeting, the SBE directed the CDE to request an ESSA waiver from the ED regarding the inclusion of RFEPs and LTELs in the ELPI (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/apr18item01.docx>).

In an October 2018 Information Memorandum to the SBE, the CDE provided an update with a detailed summary to the SBE on the ELPI waiver in the October 2018 Information Memorandum (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/infomemooct2018.asp>). This memorandum includes copies of the correspondence between the CDE and the ED through October 2018.

In an April 2019 Information Memorandum to the SBE, the CDE updated the SBE with the ED's final determination of disapproval letter (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-gad-lao-apr19item02.docx>). This decision by the ED represents the final step in the waiver process under the ESSA.

Identification of Schools

A June 2019 Information Memorandum to the SBE provides information about the ED's designation of California's Title I, Part A grant award as "high risk". (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-gacsb-gad-jun19item02.docx>). The ED's rationale for this designation is that California did not include the Progress in the Achieving English Language Proficiency Indicator (known as the ELPI) in its system of annual meaningful differentiation pursuant to the ESSA. Included in the Memorandum are several pieces of correspondence that contains both the history and substantial background on this issue.

Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)

The 2018–19 state budget funds the Proposition 98 Minimum Guarantee at \$78.4 billion. This reflects state funding of \$54.9 billion and local funding of \$23.5 billion, accounting for \$11,631 in transitional kindergarten through grade twelve per-pupil funding. The budget package fully funds the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) two years ahead of the estimated time frame for implementation. Additionally, the 2018–19 state budget provided \$50,000 to the San Joaquin Office of Education to develop a Mobile Application for the Dashboard.

Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Implementing a Combined Four-and Five-Year Graduation Rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator (11 Pages)

Attachment 2: Applying the Three-by-Five Color Table to the College/Career Indicator (4 Pages)

Attachment 3: Update on the Waiver and Identification of Schools Related to the English Learner Progress Indicator (1 Page)

Attachment 4: California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities (9 Pages)

Appendix A: Summary of States' Graduation Rate Methods (3 Pages)

Appendix B Detailed Description for Three-by-Five Color Table for the College Career Indicator—to Meet Section 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Requirements (1 Page)

Attachment 1

Implementing a Combined Four- and Five-Year Graduation Rate for the Graduation Rate Indicator

Currently, the Graduation Rate Indicator includes the four-year cohort graduation rate and the one-year Dashboard Alternative Schools Status (DASS) graduation rate. It does not capture the progress of students who take five years to graduate from high school. The State Board of Education (SBE) previously expressed an interest in using the five-year cohort graduation rate as part of the California School Dashboard (Dashboard), as it could provide an opportunity for schools to demonstrate success with students who may need additional time to earn a regular high school diploma (e.g., students with disabilities [SWD], English learners, etc.). The addition of a five-year graduation rate may also incentivize local educational agencies that currently do not offer students the opportunity to remain at a comprehensive high school for an additional year to develop programs that provide more time for students to earn a regular high school diploma when necessary.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides states the option to include a five-year graduation rate in the accountability system: however, states are required to set a more rigorous long-term goal for an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (or five-year rate), as compared to the long-term goal set for the four-year cohort graduation rate. Because no national reviews contained the detailed information needed regarding the five-year graduation rate methodologies implemented by other states, California Department of Education (CDE) staff reviewed the approved states plans for all 49 states and Puerto Rico to obtain this information (<https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplan17/statesubmission.html>). See Appendix A for a summary of the states' graduation rate methods.

The review revealed that the U.S. Department of Education (ED) approved plans that create a combined four- and five-year graduation rate (e.g., simple or weighted average) and use the same long-term goal. Based on the ED's prior approval of five-year graduation rates, using a combined rate would allow California to take the five-year graduation rate into account without having to create a separate long-term goal, which would require another set of Status cut scores along with a new five-by-five colored table and the creation of an additional high school indicator.

Because schools with DASS have their Graduation Rate Indicator calculated using the grade twelve one-year graduation rate, the five-year graduation rate will only be applied to non-alternative schools.

The five-year graduation rate is intended to be a determination of the high school outcomes of the preceding four-year cohort *non-graduates* in year five. As such, it

compares the outcomes of the same group of students one year later and offers schools and districts with additional time and incentive to work with and provide support to those students who did not graduate within four years.

At the March 2018 SBE meeting, the CDE provided an update on the development of the work to incorporate the five-year graduation rate into the Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/mar18item01.docx>).

In an August 2018 Information Memorandum, the CDE presented a set of recommended business rules for calculating a five-year graduation rate (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-pptb-amard-aug18item02.docx>).

At the March 2019 SBE meeting, the CDE outlined the following five options for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the 2019 Dashboard (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>):

1. Provide a performance level (color) for the four-year cohort graduation rate only and continue to report the five-year graduation rate for informative data only.
2. Calculate a simple average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. A simple average provides the same weight to all four and five year graduates.
3. Calculate a weighted average for the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates. This method provides more weight to students who graduate in four years (e.g., 2/3) rather than five years (e.g., 1/3).
4. Report both the four- and five-year cohort graduation rates on the Dashboard and assign the performance level (color) to the higher of the two rates. In order to continue to use the most recent data available, two different cohorts would be compared (the Class of 2019 four-year graduates and the Class of 2018 four-year graduates plus five-year graduates).
5. Add the number of students who graduated in five years to the numerator and denominator of the four-year cohort rate.

The CDE prepared several simulations, using graduation data from both the Class of 2018 (i.e., students graduating within four years) and the Class of 2017 (i.e., students graduating in four years plus students who graduated in the five years). Option 1 was ruled out because only reporting the data does not provide the same incentive for schools to keep students for an additional year if needed to earn a standard diploma. Options 2 and 3 (simple and weighted averages) were ruled out because the data simulations revealed they produced no clear or consistent patterns of difference between the four- and five-year rates for local educational agencies (LEAs), regardless of whether the LEA had a low performance color (red or orange) or high performance color (blue or green) for the 2018 four-year cohort rate: About 40 percent of LEAs had negative differences in graduation rates, and about 60 percent had positive differences

in graduation rates when the two rates were averaged. Moreover, both the simple and weighted averages resulted in lower graduation rates for a significant number of schools, simply due to the fact of combining two different groups of students from two graduating classes. Option 4 was ruled out because assigning colors to the higher graduation rate (four-year vs. five-year) results in some LEAs and schools with very low four-year graduation rates to receive substantially higher performance levels based on the five-year rates. For example, an LEA with a four-year graduation rate of 57.7 percent and a five-year graduation rate of 97.4 percent would move from a very low status to a very high status.

At its August 2018 meeting, the Technical Design Group (TDG) recommended that the five-year graduation rate be incorporated into the performance determination for the Graduation Rate Indicator. One option of interest was to use the four-year cohort graduation rate as the base, but provide additional credit for any five-year students from the previous year's cohort. An example of this option is provided below:

At Emerald High School, there are 100 students in the Class of 2018 (the four-year graduation cohort). Of these 100 students, 95 graduated within four years (e.g., by spring 2018). In addition, five students from the previous year's four-year graduation cohort (Class of 2017) graduated at the end of 2017–18 school year. These five students are therefore counted in the five-year graduation rate.

To produce a combined graduation rate for the four- and five-year graduates for 2018, we first add the number of graduates in both cohorts: $95 + 5 = 100$.

This number is the numerator of the combined rate.

The denominator is the sum of the 2018 four-year graduation cohort and the additional five-year graduates from the previous year's cohort: $100 + 5 = 105$.

The combined rate is 95.2 percent ($100/105$).

At its February 2019 meeting, the TDG requested that the CDE conduct data analyses to allow for comparisons between:

- A combined graduation rate: Students who graduated from the Class of 2018 in four years, plus students from the Class of 2017 who graduated in five years.
- The four-year graduation rate (i.e., Graduates from the Class of 2018).

School-level distributions for the combined and four-year graduation rates are presented in Table 1, below. The impact of the combined rate is more pronounced in the lower percentiles for schools.

Table 1
School Level Analyses for Graduation Rates

The Combined Graduation Rate vs. The 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Rate

Percentile	Combined Rate	Four-year Rate	Difference Between the Two Rates
5	64.6	61.9	2.7
10	76.3	74.3	2.0
15	82.1	81.5	0.6
20	85.1	84.8	0.3
25	87.4	87.1	0.3
30	89.0	88.8	0.1
35	90.2	90.1	0.1
40	91.4	91.3	0.0
45	92.6	92.6	0.1
50	93.4	93.4	0.1
55	94.0	94.0	0.0
60	94.6	94.6	0.1
65	95.3	95.2	0.0
70	95.9	95.9	0.0
75	96.5	96.4	0.0
80	97.0	97.0	0.0
85	97.6	97.5	0.0
90	98.1	98.1	0.0
95	99.0	99.0	0.0

Note: School graduation rate distribution analysis includes only non-DASS (traditional and charter) schools. There are a total of 1,418 schools with 30 or more students.

Comparisons between charter and non-charter schools are presented in Table 2. In the lower percentiles, charter schools benefit more from the combined rate than non-charter schools.

Table 2
Charter Schools vs. Non-Charter Schools and the Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Rate
School Level Analyses

Percentile	Non-Charter Combined Rate	Non-Charter Four-year Rate	Non-Charter Difference Between the Two Rates	Charter Combined Rate	Charter Four-year Rate	Charter Difference Between the Two Rates
5	71.7	70.5	1.2	47.2	42.6	4.6
10	80.5	80.4	0.1	61.3	58.7	2.6
15	84.7	84.4	0.3	68.6	66.2	2.4
20	87.1	87.0	0.1	75.8	74.1	1.7
25	88.6	88.5	0.1	79.2	78.3	0.9
30	90.1	90.0	0.1	82.9	82.5	0.4
35	91.3	91.3	0.1	85.0	84.0	1.0
40	92.5	92.5	0.0	87.3	86.9	0.4
45	93.3	93.3	0.1	89.3	89.0	0.3
50	93.9	93.8	0.0	90.1	89.8	0.2
55	94.4	94.3	0.0	91.2	91.0	0.2
60	94.9	94.9	0.0	92.6	92.6	0.0
65	95.5	95.5	0.0	93.7	93.6	0.1
70	96.0	96.0	0.0	95.0	94.9	0.0
75	96.5	96.5	0.0	96.2	96.2	0.0
80	97.0	96.9	0.0	97.3	97.3	0.0
85	97.4	97.4	0.0	98.1	98.1	0.0
90	98.0	98.0	0.0	98.7	98.7	0.0
95	98.8	98.8	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

Note: The total number of schools with 30 or more students: charter schools = 312 and non-charter schools = 1,106.

Comparisons between small and large schools are presented in Table 3. Small schools see larger increases in graduation rates in the lower percentiles with the combined rate. This result is expected due to the impact that only a few students can have on smaller n-sizes.

Table 3
School Comparison
Small vs. Large and the Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Percentile	Large Combined Rate	Large Four-Year Rate	Large Difference Between the Two Rates	Small Combined Rate:	Small Four-Year Rate	Small Difference Between the Two Rates
5	79.9	79.3	0.6	53.1	47.4	5.7
10	84.4	84.0	0.4	62.5	61.0	1.5
15	87.0	86.8	0.2	70.7	68.4	2.3
20	88.4	88.2	0.2	75.6	73.7	1.9
25	89.6	89.5	0.1	79.2	78.0	1.2
30	90.8	90.7	0.1	82.8	82.5	0.3
35	92.0	91.9	0.1	85.3	84.7	0.6
40	92.9	92.8	0.0	87.8	87.5	0.3
45	93.5	93.4	0.0	89.7	89.5	0.1
50	94.0	94.0	0.0	91.1	90.9	0.2
55	94.5	94.5	0.0	92.5	92.5	0.0
60	95.0	95.0	0.1	93.8	93.7	0.1
65	95.5	95.5	0.0	94.4	94.4	0.1
70	96.1	96.0	0.0	95.6	95.5	0.1
75	96.4	96.4	0.0	96.5	96.5	0.0
80	96.9	96.9	0.0	97.2	97.2	0.0
85	97.4	97.4	0.0	98.0	98.0	0.0
90	97.9	97.9	0.0	98.7	98.7	0.0
95	98.7	98.6	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

Note for Table 3: Large schools are defined as having 150 or more students. The total number of large schools = 876. Small schools are defined as having less than 150 students. The total number of small school = 542. The four-year graduation rate is based on the 2017–18 graduation cohort.

District-level distributions for the combined and four-year graduation rates are presented in Table 4. The impact of the combined rate is more pronounced in the lower percentiles.

Table 4
District Level Graduation Rates Analyses: The Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Rate

Percentile	Combined Rate	Four-Year Rate	Difference Between the Two Rates
5	62.0	59.4	2.7
10	76.2	74.6	1.6
15	81.3	81.1	0.3
20	84.6	83.6	1.0
25	86.3	86.0	0.3
30	88.1	87.9	0.2
35	89.4	89.3	0.1
40	90.2	90.1	0.1
45	90.9	90.8	0.1
50	91.6	91.6	0.0
55	92.5	92.4	0.1
60	93.3	93.2	0.1
65	94.1	94.1	0.0
70	94.7	94.7	0.0
75	95.5	95.4	0.1
80	96.1	96.1	0.0
85	96.9	96.8	0.0
90	97.8	97.8	0.0
95	98.9	98.9	0.0

Note: LEA graduation rate distribution analysis includes districts and non-DASS charter schools (i.e., counties are excluded).

Comparisons between large and small districts are presented in Table 5. Small districts see larger increases in graduation rates in the lower percentiles with the combined rate, due to the impact that only a few students can make on smaller n-sizes.

Table 5

District Comparison: Large vs. Small and the Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Rate

Percentile	Large Combined Rate	Large Four-Year Rate	Large Difference Between the Two Rates	Small Combined Rate	Small Four-Year Rate	Small Difference Between the Two Rates
5	78.3	77.1	1.2	53.2	51.0	2.2
10	83.8	83.5	0.3	66.9	64.0	2.9
15	85.9	85.6	0.3	75.1	73.7	1.4
20	87.2	86.9	0.4	79.4	78.7	0.6
25	88.6	88.5	0.1	82.6	81.9	0.6
30	89.6	89.3	0.2	84.8	83.7	1.0
35	90.4	90.4	0.1	86.9	86.6	0.4
40	90.9	90.8	0.1	89.0	88.8	0.2
45	91.4	91.3	0.0	89.9	89.8	0.1
50	91.8	91.8	0.1	91.0	90.8	0.2
55	92.4	92.4	0.0	92.6	92.4	0.1
60	93.2	93.1	0.0	93.4	93.4	0.0
65	94.0	93.9	0.0	94.3	94.3	0.0
70	94.4	94.4	0.0	95.2	95.1	0.1
75	95.1	95.1	0.0	96.1	96.1	0.0
80	95.6	95.6	0.0	97.2	97.2	0.1
85	96.1	96.1	0.0	98.0	98.0	0.0
90	96.9	96.8	0.0	98.6	98.6	0.0
95	97.6	97.6	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

Large LEAs/charters are defined as having 150 or more students. Large LEAs/charters = 358. Small LEAs/charters are defined as having less than 150 students. Small LEAs/charters = 340. The four-year graduation rate is based on the 2017–18 graduation cohort.

Finally, statewide and schoolwide comparisons by student group are presented in Tables 6 and 7, respectively.

Table 6
State Comparison: Student Groups
The Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Rate

Student Group	Combined Graduation Rate (Four-Year plus DASS Rate plus Five-Year)	2017–18 Graduation Rate (Four-Year plus DASS Rate)	Difference Between the Two Rates
All Students	83.7	83.5	0.2
African American	72.4	72.1	0.4
English Learner	71.7	70.9	0.8
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	72.2	71.4	0.8
Foster Youth	60.0	59.0	1.0

Table 7
School Comparison: Student Groups
The Combined Graduation Rate vs. the 2017–18 Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rate

Percentile	All Students Combined Rate	EL Combined Rate	SWD Combined Rate	All Students Four-Year Rate	EL Four-Year Rate	SWD Four-Year Rate	All Students Difference Between the Two Rates	EL Difference Between the Two Rates	SWD Difference Between the Two Rates
5	64.6	55.8	56.1	61.9	52.8	53.1	2.7	3.0	3.0
10	76.3	62.3	60.5	74.3	61.0	59.5	2.0	1.3	0.9
15	82.1	68.8	64.6	81.5	66.9	63.0	0.6	1.8	1.5
20	85.1	71.1	67.0	84.8	69.7	66.7	0.3	1.4	0.3
25	87.4	73.2	69.5	87.1	72.4	68.4	0.3	0.8	1.1
30	89.0	75.4	71.2	88.8	74.5	70.0	0.1	0.9	1.2
35	90.2	77.5	72.7	90.1	77.0	72.2	0.1	0.5	0.5
40	91.4	79.2	74.5	91.3	78.7	73.8	0.0	0.5	0.6
45	92.6	81.0	76.5	92.6	80.3	75.7	0.1	0.7	0.8
50	93.4	82.5	78.2	93.4	82.0	77.4	0.1	0.5	0.8
55	94.0	84.0	79.7	94.0	83.7	79.4	0.0	0.3	0.3
60	94.6	85.3	81.3	94.6	85.1	81.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
65	95.3	87.0	83.0	95.2	86.5	82.6	0.0	0.5	0.4
70	95.9	88.5	84.8	95.9	88.2	84.4	0.0	0.2	0.5
75	96.5	89.8	86.7	96.4	89.6	86.4	0.0	0.2	0.2
80	97.0	90.9	88.2	97.0	90.8	88.0	0.0	0.1	0.2
85	97.6	92.6	89.5	97.5	92.5	89.2	0.0	0.2	0.3
90	98.1	93.8	91.4	98.1	93.8	91.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
95	99.0	95.8	94.6	99.0	95.8	94.5	0.0	0.0	0.1

At the April 2019 meeting, the TDG examined the differences between the combined rate and four-year graduation rates and recommended that the combined rate—which represents all four and five year graduates—be used to calculate the Graduation Rate Indicator in the 2019 Dashboard. The TDG also recommended that the CDE provide a breakdown of the four- and five-year graduation rates, as well as the Grade 12 DASS graduation rate, in the 2019 Dashboard Detailed Reports.

The CDE presented the combined rate to the California Practitioners Advisory Group (CPAG) at its meeting on June 10, 2019. Most members agreed that the combined rate was the best option for incorporating the five-year graduation rate into the Graduation Rate Indicator. In addition, members requested that the four- and five-year graduation rates be reported separately as well, for informational purposes.

Attachment 2

Applying the Three-by-Five Color Table to the College/Career Indicator

In September 2017, the State Board of Education (SBE) approved an alternative methodology—known as the “three-by-five” color table—for assigning performance levels to local education agencies (LEAs) or schools that serve small student populations (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr17/documents/sep17item02.doc>).

Application of the three-by-five color table results in a refiguring of the performance level tables by removing two Change levels—Increased Significantly and Decreased Significantly—and thus limiting extreme changes in small student populations. This methodology, which limits large swings in the Change data that can be triggered by just a few students, was originally approved for two state indicators:

- Graduation Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer students are in the graduating cohort
- Suspension Rate Indicator: Applied if 149 or fewer are cumulatively enrolled

In July 2018, the SBE approved that the methodology also be applied at the student group level for these two indicators (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/jul18item01.docx>).

At its November 2018 meeting, the SBE approved applying this methodology to the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator (reported for the first time in the 2018 Dashboard), when 149 or fewer students are enrolled (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr18/documents/nov18item04.docx>).

At the March 2019 SBE meeting, the California Department of Education (CDE) proposed that, beginning with the 2019 Dashboard, the three-by-five methodology be applied to the College/Career Indicator (CCI) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/ag/ag/yr19/documents/mar19item17.docx>). This proposal was made because the CCI is based on the same cohort of students used in the calculations for the Graduation Rate Indicator, which already applies the three-by-five table to small student populations. The proposal receives the support of the Technical Design Group.

Figure 1 illustrates the three-by-five colored table for the CCI. As referenced above, the two Change columns “Declined Significantly” and “Increased Significantly” are removed, resulting in a table that has three Change columns (i.e., Declined, Maintained, and Increased) and five Status rows (i.e., Very High, High, Medium, Low, and Very Low). There are still five possible performance levels (colors)

that LEAs, schools, and student groups can receive if their graduating cohort size is between 30 to 149 students.

Figure 1: Three-by-Five Color Table for the CCI

Performance Level	Declined Significantly from Prior Year (by 9.1% or more)	Declined from Prior Year (by 2.0% to 9.0%)	Maintained from Prior Year (declined or increased by 1.9% or less)	Increased from Prior Year (by 2.0% to 8.9%)	Increased Significantly from Prior Year (by 9.0% or more)
Very High 70.0% or greater in Current Year	Yellow	Green	Blue	Blue	Blue
High 55.0% to 69.9% in Current Year	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green	Blue
Medium 35.0% to less than 54.9% in Current Year	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Green	Green
Low 10.0% to 34.9% in Current Year	Red	Orange	Orange	Yellow	Yellow
Very Low 9.9% or lower in Current Year	Red	Red	Red	Orange	Yellow

The impact of applying the three-by-five color table at the LEA level is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
LEA Color Change Direction

Change Direction	Number and Percent of LEAs
Lower Performance	4 (1.0%)
No Change	406 (98.0%)
Higher Performance	4 (1.0%)
Total	414 (100%)

The impact is minimal. Only eight LEAs (2 percent) have a change in direction as a result of applying the three-by-five color table to the CCI.

Table 2 shows the impact of applying the three-by-five color table at the school level.

Table 2
School Color Change Direction

Change Direction	Number and Percent of Schools
Lower Performance	27 (1.5%)
No Change	1,722 (96.4%)
Higher Performance	38 (2.1%)
Total	1,787 (100%)

Only 65 schools (3.6 percent) have a change in direction as a result of applying the three-by-five color table to the CCI.

The impact is greater at the student group level, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Student Group Change Direction

Change Direction	Number and Percent of Student Groups
Lower Performance	172 (2.0%)
No Change	7,930 (93.9%)
Higher Performance	345 (4.1%)
Total	8,447 (100%)

Six point one percent of student groups had a color change with the application of the three-by-five table. Three hundred forty-five student groups received a higher performance color: Red to Orange, Orange to Yellow, or Yellow to Green. One hundred seventy-two student groups received a lower performance color: Yellow to Orange.

Table 4 shows that applying the three-by-five color table has the most significant impact for Hispanic, homeless, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

Table 4
Color Change by Student Group

Student Group	Lower Performance	No Change	Higher Performance	Total
African American	4 (1.1%)	349 (91.8%)	27 (7.1%)	380
American Indian	0 (0.0%)	7 (87.5%)	1 (12.5%)	8
Asian	10 (2.2%)	429 (92.3%)	26 (5.6%)	465
EL	2 (0.2%)	883 (96.9%)	26 (2.9%)	911
Filipino	9 (4.5%)	173 (86.1%)	19 (9.5%)	201
Foster	0 (0.0%)	76 (97.4%)	2 (2.6%)	78
Hispanic	38 (2.2%)	1,665 (94.7%)	56 (3.2%)	1,759
Homeless	7 (1.6%)	367 (85.0%)	58 (13.4%)	432
Multiple Race	13 (8.0%)	134 (82.2%)	16 (9.8%)	163
Pacific Islander	0 (0.0%)	10 (90.9%)	1 (9.1%)	11
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	43 (2.2%)	1,891 (94.5%)	68 (3.4%)	2,002
Students with Disabilities	4 (0.4%)	909 (98.0%)	15 (1.6%)	928
White	42 (3.8%)	1,037 (93.5%)	30 (2.7%)	1,109

The CDE shared this data at the CPAG meeting on June 10, 2019. Members agreed that the three-by-five color table be applied to the CCI.

Attachment 3

Update on the Waiver and Identification of Schools Related to the English Learner Progress Indicator

Waiver

On April 15, 2019, the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California State Board of Education (SBE) received the final determination of disapproval letter from the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on the inclusion Reclassified Fluent English Proficient (RFEP) and Long Term English Learner (LTEL) students into the English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) (<https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/pn/im/documents/memo-gad-lao-apr19item02.docx>). This decision by the ED represents the final step in the waiver process under the Every Student Succeeds Acts (ESSA).

After convening with the ELPI Workgroup on May 20, 2019, members agreed that the CDE had exhausted all available options in an attempt to include RFEP and LTEL students into the final ELPI and should consider the matter settled.

One recommendation at the ELPI Workgroup meeting was to take into consideration the performance of RFEP and LTEL students in the determination for the California Distinguished Schools Program or other school award programs. The CDE will continue to explore this as an option with the ELPI Workgroup moving forward. The CDE meets with the ELPI Workgroup twice this fall to further discuss, among other items, this option.

Identification of Schools

On June 3, 2019, the State Board of Education (SBE) and California Department of Education (CDE), collectively California, received notification that the U.S. Department of Education (ED) had designated California's Title I, Part A grant award as "high risk".

In response to ED's letter, the SBE and CDE on June 13, 2019, stated that this designation is unnecessary as California provided the ED in December 2018 with a proposed Amendment to California's ESSA State Plan detailing a commitment to incorporate the ELPI into the identification of CSI and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) schools for the 2019–20 school year, which is the specific condition that ED noted as necessary to remove the high-risk determination on the Title I grant. The CDE and SBE also highlighted California's plan to incorporate ELPI in the annual meaningful differentiation of schools as soon as the second year of data is available which will be the 2019 Dashboard.

Additionally, California has committed to, and proposed amendments to the State Plan to reflect, a second consecutive year of CSI and ATSI identification for 2019–20 rather than the every-three-year timeline as required by ESSA and reflected in California's currently approved State Plan. California proactively modified its timeline for identifying schools for CSI and ATSI to include a consecutive identification in the 2019–20 school year (based on the 2018 and 2019 Dashboard), before transitioning to the every-three-year cycle, to ensure that the ELPI Status is included in the designation of schools at the earliest practical time given California's transition to the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California.

Attachment 4

California School Dashboard Educational Outreach Activities

Table 1. California Department of Education Policy Work Group Meetings

Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Topics
April 10, 2019	Growth Model Stakeholder Session 2	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reviewed calendar and timeline• Lessons learned from last meeting• Gallery walk through interpretations and voting• Analyzed interpretations• Conducted rank-choice and rating scale voting for interpretations
April 11, 2019	Alternative Schools Task Force Local Indicator Subcommittee	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussed possible measures for consideration in a positive transition local indicator for the California School Dashboard (Dashboard)
April 16, 2019	Technical Design Group (TDG)	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inclusion of the California Alternate Assessments in Distance from Standard calculations for the Academic Indicator• English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI)• Inclusion of the Five-Year Graduation Rate in the Dashboard• Review data on the use of the District of Residence Rule for the Indicator

Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Topics
May 20, 2019	English Learner Progress Indicator (ELPI) Workgroup	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Waiver for the inclusion of reclassified fluent English proficient and long-term English learners • The English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) summative assessment overview • ELPI Status in determining school and local education agency (LEA) eligibility for assistance
May 24, 2019	Alternative Schools Task Force Local Indicator Subcommittee	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential modifications to the Academic Indicator • Definitions of College/Career Indicator (CCI) measures for collection in the 2018–19 and 2019–20 school years
May 29, 2019	Growth Model Stakeholder Session 3	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of how selected other states present growth model information • In-depth review of theories of action • Full group discussion of theories of action • Discussion of how to have conversations with community and colleagues about the work of the Growth Model Stakeholder Group

Table 2. In-person Meetings/Conferences

Date		Title		Estimated Number of Attendees		Topics
March 22, 2019		CABE	70			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of all EL data on the Dashboard Provided live demonstration of new features of the Dashboard, including the Spanish translation of each page
March 28, 2019		Council of Chief State School Officers: Trends in State Accountability Systems—Measuring and Using Chronic Absenteeism Data	80			Overview of how chronic absenteeism is used in California's accountability system
March 29, 2019		System of Support for Bilingual Coordinators Network	20	80		Geographic Information System Mapping with the state indicators (CCI and Suspension): district- and school-level indicator data
March 6, 2019		San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Counselor Conference: State Special Education Data Dashboard Overview and Deeper Dive into the Chronic Absenteeism Indicator	25			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented new features of the Dashboard, including the increased focus on equity and the additional reports and resources available to schools and districts on the California Department of Education's website. Performance for California State Special Schools on State Indicators Dashboard Resources suspensions impact chronic absenteeism
March 21, 2019		Spring Foster Youth Services Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) High School Education Council Meeting	50	17		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided updates on use of Foster Youth data on the Dashboard and DataQuest New Look and Feel of the 2018 Dashboard New resources for the Dashboard Responded to technical questions and answers March 2019 State Board of Education revisions under consideration for the 2019 Dashboard
April 3, 2019		"Partnering with K-12 on Data" for the California Community College Association for Occupational Education (CCCAOE)	25	40		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leveraging existing EL data for school and district planning purposes
March 21, 2019		Linked Learning Convention	16			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of current measures used in the CCI
Date	Title		Estimated Number of Attendees		Topics	
April 8, 2019	Association of California School Administrators Legislative Action Day: Accountability and System of Support Update		80		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the work planned for the 2019 Dashboard and ongoing development of the Dashboard Overview of the system of support 	
April 9, 2019	Professional Development for County Offices of Education Eligible for Differentiated		68		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the Dashboard Review of Criteria Used to Identify LEAs for Support under Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) County offices of education (COEs) and Dashboard Alternative School Status (DASS) 	

Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Topics
May 15, 2019	Regional Assessment Network (RAN)	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of the 3 X 5 Color Grid for the CCI Revisions to the 5 X 5 Reports Addition of a County List of Districts Five-Year Graduation Rate Inclusion of the California Alternate Assessment (CAA) in the Academic Indicator Update on the Growth Model Work
May 15, 2019	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) CTE Meeting	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions of career CCI measures to be collected in CALPADS in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school years
May 15, 2019	CCSESA Curriculum and Instructional Services Accountability Sub-committee	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on May 2019 State Board of Education action related to accountability Overview of 2019 Dashboard Workplan
May 16, 2019	Monterey County Office of Education	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the Dashboard Deep Dive into State Indicators Academic Indicator Suspension Indicator Chronic Absenteeism Indicator DASS Graduation Rate College/Career Indicator English Learner Progress Indicator Demographic Data for Student Groups
May 17, 2019	State and Federal Programs Directors Meeting	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the incorporation of the CAA in the academic indicator Demonstration of the new accountability reports available
Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Topics
June 2, 2019	Bilingual Coordinators Network	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELPI EL Data on DataQuest
June 7, 2019	California Education Policy Fellowship Program: Using Data at the System Level	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy framework for accountability How local and state accountability improve education The limitations of the accountability system
June 10, 2019	California Practitioners Advisory Group	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporating a Five-Year Graduation Rate into the Graduation Rate Indicator Application of Three-by-Five Colored Tables to CCI

Table 3. Webinars

Date	Title	Estimated Number of Attendees	Topics
February 28, 2019	California Advisory Task Force on Alternative Schools	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Work on Students with Disabilities (SWDs): District of Residence • Local Indicators: Next Steps • Incorporation of Modified Methods for CCI • Possible Modified Methods for Other State Indicators
March 11, 2019	Growth Model Stakeholder Webinar	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed information provided at the February 4, 2019 stakeholder meeting for stakeholder that were unable to attend.
April 9, 2019	CALPADS Information Meeting (CIM)	940	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDE Update • CALPADS Support Update
April 19, 2019	Every Student Succeeds Act Stakeholder Meeting	120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Updates • Promoting Equitable Access to Teachers Program • The Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) as the School Plan • Wester Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and schools eligible for Comprehensive Support and Improvement • Submission of the LCAP Federal Addendum • Five-Year Graduation Rate
May 17, 2019	ESSA Stakeholder Meeting	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Updates: ELPI Waiver • Comprehensive Support and Improvement Funding Update • Submission of the LCAP Federal Addendum • Federal Budget and Appropriations • ESSA Report Cards • Per-Pupil Expenditure Reporting Expenditure Requirement

Appendix A

Summary of States' Graduation Rate Methods

Nineteen states use only the four-year graduation rate for accountability purposes. Many of these states, like Massachusetts and Oregon, publish data for extended year cohort graduation rates, broken down by student groups.

California	Montana
District of Columbia	North Carolina
Florida	Oregon
Hawaii	Puerto Rico
Idaho	South Carolina
Kansas	South Dakota
Massachusetts	Tennessee
Minnesota	Texas
Mississippi	Virginia
Missouri	Wyoming

Sixteen states use a Weighted Average of a four-year and five-year or additional extended cohort rate for their Graduation Rate Indicator according to their Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State Plan.

Table 1: States' Weighted Averages

State	Four-Year	Five-Year	Six- or Seven-Year
Alabama	80.0%	20.0%	n/a
Alaska	75.0%	25.0%	n/a
Arizona	45.0%	35.0%	15%, 5%
Arkansas	66.6%	33.3%	n/a
Delaware	Higher	n/a	n/a
Georgia	66.6%	33.3%	n/a
Illinois	60.0%	30.0%	10.0%
Maine	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maryland	66.6%	33.3%	n/a
Michigan	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%
Nevada	66.6%	33.3%	n/a
New Mexico	66.6%	22.2%	11.1%
Ohio	66.6%	33.3%	n/a
Oklahoma	43.0%	36.0%	21.0%
Pennsylvania	n/a	n/a	n/a
Utah*	90.0%	10.0%	n/a

* Utah does not include the five-year rate if it is not higher than the four-year rate.

-- Weightings not indicated.

Eight states use a Simple Average of their four-year, five-year and/or six-year cohort.

Table 2: States' Simple Averages (Equal Weighting)

State	Four-Year	Five-Year	Six-Year
Connecticut	Yes	n/a	Yes
Iowa	Yes	Yes	n/a
Kentucky	Yes	Yes	n/a
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	n/a
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	n/a
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rhode Island*	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vermont	Yes	n/a	Yes

* Rhode Island uses the four-year rate and a simple average of the four-year, five-year, and six-year rate combined.

Three states use the highest graduation rate.

Table 3: States' Highest Graduation Rates

State	Description
Colorado	Four-year is weighted by 1 percent and highest of the four, five, six, or seven-year graduation rate is weighted by 99 percent
North Dakota	Highest of the four, five, or six-year graduation rate
Indiana	Sum of the four-year graduation rate and the percentage of students from the previous cohort graduating exactly within five-years

Two states report graduation rates as two separate dashboard measures.

Table 4: States' Separate Measures

State	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate
Minnesota	Four-year	Seven-year
West Virginia	Four-year	Five-year

Three states use some other method of incorporating extended year cohorts.

Table 5: Additional Points Method

State	Description
Louisiana	Louisiana “Strength of diploma” index score, based on weighted average point values across students within a cohort. (four, five and six-year)
Nebraska	Four-year graduation rate plus adjustment for seven-year graduation rate for students with disabilities
Washington	Four-year graduation rate plus potential bonus points based on sum of four, five and six-year rates

Appendix B

Detailed Description for Three-by-Five Color Table for the College/Career Indicator — to Meet Section 508 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 Requirements

A modified version of the College/Career Indicator five-by-five table. This modified version is known as the three-by-five table and is used for small student populations with an n-size of 149 or less to determine a performance color for the graduation rate, suspension rate, and chronic absenteeism indicators only. In the three-by-five model, the “Declined Significantly” and “Increase Significantly” columns for Change Performance Levels are eliminated. To depict this modification, all the performance color boxes under the both the “Declined Significantly” and “Increased Significantly” columns found in a traditional five-by-five table are outlined with a red-dotted line indicating these columns are not used to determine performance levels (color). Removing the far right and far left columns can impact the performance color for a school or student group if they have 149 or fewer students. For the Graduation Rate Indicator, if a small population has a high Status Level and a Change Level of Declined significantly, a performance color of Orange would be assigned based on the five-by-five table. However, because the Declined Significantly column is eliminated for small populations, the performance level assigned based on the three-by-five table would be Yellow.